

CW



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,606	09/16/2003	Jacey Robert Beaucage	HSJ920030185US2	3542
48583	7590	01/25/2005	EXAMINER	
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, LLP			MCDONALD, SHANTESE L	
PO BOX 61389				
HOUSTON, TX 77208-1389			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3723	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/663,606

Applicant(s)

BEAUCAGE ET AL.

Examiner

Shantese L. McDonald

Art Unit

3723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,6-11 and 13-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,6,8-11,13,15 and 16 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 7,14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/27/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kojima et al. in view of Zhang et al, in further view of Cote et al.

Kojima et al. teaches a method of predicting the lapping property comprising positioning a tool, 6, on a lapping plate, 10, charging the lapping plate with abrasive, (col. 2, line 56-57), rotating the lapping plate, restraining the tool relative to the lapping plate, measuring a frictional force between the tool and the lapping plate, measuring a consumption of the tool by the lapping plate and determining a lapping rate of the lapping plate, (col. 4, lines 15-37), and rotating the lapping plate for a specific time, determining the lapping rate over a time interval and assessing the lapping rate and friction, (col. 5, line 28- col. 6, line 57).

Kojima et al. teaches all the limitations of the claims except for calculating a coefficient of friction and a Preston coefficient of the lapping plate and mounting a plurality of specimens to the tool for contact with the lapping plate. Zhang et al. teaches calculating a coefficient of friction and a Preston coefficient of the lapping plate, (col. 6, lines 51- col. 7, line 37). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to calculate the coefficient of friction and a

Preston coefficient of the lapping plate of Kojima et al, since the method of Kojima et al., is relating to determining a lapping rate.

Cote teaches mounting a plurality of specimens, 28, to the tool for contact with the lapping plate. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to utilize the tool of Cote, in order to lap a plurality of specimens, in order to increase the production efficiency.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3,6,8-11,13,15 and 16 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7 and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shantese L. McDonald whose telephone number is (703) 308-8722. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on (703) 308-2687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S.L.M.
January 13, 2005



Joseph J. Hail, III
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3700